



City of Seattle

Urban Forestry Commission

SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Becca Neumann (Position #4 – Hydrologist), Co-chair
Joshua Morris (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair
Laura Keil (Position #10 – Get Engaged), Co-Chair
Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • Falisha Kurji (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency)
Stuart Niven (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA) • Hao Liang (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA)
David Baker (Position # 8 – Development) • Blake Voorhees (Position # 9 – Realtor)
Jessica Hernandez (Position #11 – Environmental Justice) • Jessica Jones (Position # 12 – Public Health)
Lia Hall (Position #13 – Community/Neighborhood)

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

Meeting notes

January 4, 2023, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Via Webex call and in-person at the
Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 1872 (18th floor)
700 5th Avenue, Seattle

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2493 877 0539

Meeting password: 1234

Attending

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair
Becca Neumann – Co-Chair
Laura Keil
Falisha Kurji
Hao Liang
Jessica Jones
Lia Hall

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Absent- Excused

Julia Michalak
Stuart Niven
David Moehring
Blake Voorhees
Jessica Hernandez

Public

Steve Zemke

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at:
<https://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocuments>

Call to order: Josh called the meeting to order and offered a land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Steve Zemke provided some clarifications and information regarding the Tree Service Provider Registration ordinance proposed amendments, including changes to the definition of major pruning. The Urban Forest protection ordinance does not currently include a requirement for a landscape plan and a tree inventory for development projects, but those are important as a source of tree loss and replacement information, and that information should already be collected anyway. The draft ordinance also proposes only 12" trees be required on the site plans, but 6" trees are required during platting, and requiring trees down to 6" be included would cover 45% of the trees.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti noted that she had been serving in the UFC coordinator role in an interim basis since she came into it upon Sandra's retirement in May 2021, but in October 2022, the City finished the recruitment process for the position and Patti will be serving in the role on a permanent basis moving forward.

Josh shared an update on Position 8, the Development representative position. David Moehring's reappointment was not moved forward and another candidate has been moved forward for appointment by the Mayor's Office. That appointment is set to be considered at the next Land Use Committee meeting. This topic will be added to the next meeting's agenda, so that the Commission can consider a response expressing concerns with the process. Stuart sent a letter to the Mayor and City Council in response to the results of this process; Josh encouraged Commissioners to review that.

Adoption of December 7 and 21 meeting notes

Action: A motion to approve the December 7, 2022 meeting notes as written was made, seconded and approved.

Action: A motion to approve the December 21, 2022 meeting notes as written was made, seconded and approved.

Tree Service Provider Registration legislation potential amendments

Josh reviewed the proposed changes to the ordinance passed last year, that the Land Use Committee is considering. These focus on the definition of and work allowed on hedges, changing the definition of major pruning, and removing the on-site public noticing requirement and replacing it with an online reporting system. Commissioners discussed and clarified the potential changes, and reviewed some of their thoughts about the changes.

Josh walked through the draft letter he prepared for this, which thanks the Land Use Committee for their attention to this and includes three main comment areas: the definition of hedges (recommending that they not be excluded from reportable tree work), the definition of major pruning (recommending that the definition not be changed), and the public noticing requirement (acknowledging the negative aspects of on-site noticing and recommending an online system as well as some other ways of getting the word out on tree work.) Commissioners discussed the letter and made additional edits to it.

Action: A motion to approve the letter regarding the Tree Service Provider Registration ordinance potential amendments was made, seconded and approved.

Urban Forest Ordinance update response

Josh provided the recap that the draft letter for this response was discussed at the last meeting, and is in response to SDCI's December 7 update on the status of the Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Josh walked through the content of the letter, and noted some additional content that had been added since the last discussion on it, including two new areas for calls to strengthen the ordinance. The original had two areas calling for strengthening the ordinance: reducing the tree removal allowances and increasing tree replacement requirements. The added sections focus on requiring tree inventories and landscaping plans, and emphasizing that maximizing tree retention is a goal and expectation of new development.

Commissioners discussed the letter and made additional edits to it.

Action: A motion to approve the letter regarding the Urban Forest Ordinance update was made, seconded and approved.

2022 Annual Report – draft language review

Patti reviewed the process for development of the draft language to be included in the annual report. The first draft was shared with the UFC previously, with Commissioners providing suggestions for additional content and changes. Patti has since incorporated that input into the current draft, along with some edits suggested by Becca. Patti reviewed the sections and content of the report, and Commissioners offered additional edits. The next step for this will be for Patti to incorporate the report text into the report template and bring a draft designed report back to the UFC for review at the next meeting.

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Public comment:

Steve Zemke noted that the last public meeting regarding the Comprehensive Plan will happen next week. They are also looking at developing an online option for providing public input for folks who are not able to attend the public meetings. He urges Commissioners to get on the mailing for this effort and follow what is happening with it. Also, the Tree Service Provider Registration ordinance amendments will be on the agenda for next week's Land Use Committee meeting. Then two weeks following that they'll vote on it before it goes to the full Council. There are also state legislature efforts to follow: House Bill 1078 would require cities that have tree protection ordinances to set up tree banks. This is basically the tree replacement fund with a different name, and would help with tree canopy protection across the state. There will also be housing legislation that can impact trees as the state decides to overrule local regulations.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:16 PM

Sorry my phone is going to die. Will call back in

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:23 PM

Yes Dan Strauss said he would do that! the online posting

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:24 PM

In the Land Use Committee Strauss said on line posting was possible. He agreed in a separate conversation I had with him.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:28 PM

The 25% rule would probably mean very few work reports on pruning yet the work could be a problem. eg someone topping a tree as I observed in my neighborhood recently

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:28 PM

Can this be checked with ISA guidelines? I think for 25% removal it can't be every year.

from Theodore to everyone: 3:29 PM

I wonder, does anyone know why the standard for pruning is being changed only to account for significantly larger branches and roots?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:32 PM

The root pruning size is not changed. It is only the limbs and 15 to -25% parts.

from Becca Neumann to everyone: 3:33 PM

I just looked up ANSI pruning standard and it says not to remove more than 25 percent of the total tree foliage in a single year

from Theodore to everyone: 3:34 PM

I see, sorry to misunderstand on the roots. In any case do we know what is the logic on the increase in sizes where it is happening?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:34 PM

The ordinance is only noting work being done. being reported. It is not a permit system.

from Hao Liang to everyone: 3:35 PM

structural defects

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:36 PM

The concern is not letting developers remove boundary trees by calling them a "hedge".

from Hao Liang to everyone: 3:37 PM

sorry, I lost my typing words. This is for Sandy's question, generally large, mature trees should require little routine pruning. The pruning usually should be limited to dead branches.

from Theodore to everyone: 3:37 PM

Understood, thank you Sandy.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:38 PM

Thanks Hao! Clearly 25% per year is essentially pollarding!

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:39 PM

i see the hedge definition being used to remove boundary trees.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:44 PM

I think the height definition is a good one. Maybe any hedges over 8 feet need to be considered tree work so that the work can be reported

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:50 PM

change minor to "not reportable" as tree work

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:52 PM

The idea is that qualified people are approving or doing the work by ISA standards.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:54 PM

One problem with hazard trees is being certain a qualified hazard tree expert is doing the evaluation.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:57 PM

Branch size raised means less tree work would have to be reported.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:00 PM

Some trees like Douglas have more brittle branches that break off with heavy snow and ice on branches

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:00 PM

Douglas fir

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:02 PM

Could add that permit is in force for 3 months so lessens scheduling problems for arborists

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:03 PM

Arborists once work is approved by customer could send them filled out sign forms in plastic cover. Could have 2 week notice on line and 1 week on site. to cover mailing

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:05 PM

Can have a sign up list on tree work that neighborhoods could check or be mailed notice if interested. Same system in place for SDCI building permits.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:05 PM

I think we need to emphasize that this is an equity issue. People who are busy working and not involved in community issues due to time constraints should have access to info about the trees right around them.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:07 PM

Yes large fine I think \$3000 and would count toward their violations. Maybe recommend reduce fine on posting but leave it for online filing of work.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:07 PM

Yes online with easier access for the public.)

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:09 PM

Agree, the online system is very important and shall be more accessible. Maybe we can add after "...online public notice system" , "for notification and recording tracking"

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:09 PM

UFC has a sign up list to receive e-mails. Local organizations could ask to be added to list. as well as individuals.

from Jessica Jones to everyone: 4:11 PM

Online platforms like Next Door, community groups or neighborhood associations (e.g. Uptown Alliance in Uptown), City Council or elected representative newsletters

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:13 PM

The online posting is essential for people who want to confirm that work done is what they said would be done. eg remove 2 significant trees but neighbors notice 4 trees removed. Way for accountability of work done.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:14 PM

Urgent work is covered under hazard, where they would report work within a week for example.

from Andrea Starbird to everyone: 4:15 PM

Hello, I am an ISA Certified Arborist and ISA Certified Municipal Specialist and am actively working in the field. At some point, can the council comment on how/if working arborists have been engaged to comment on their experiences with the current ordinance requirements? I ask because I heard Joshua and Hao mention they would be interested in hearing the perspectives of professionals working in the field earlier in the meeting.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:15 PM

Recommend 3 months.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:16 PM

Not a permit

from Andrea Starbird to everyone: 4:16 PM

It is only a notice, not a permit

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:16 PM

I agree with Steve--3 months would be fine. The idea is that it's less stressful for arborists if it doesn't expire quickly

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:16 PM

Permits are what we have been asking for so work can be approved in advance.

from Andrea Starbird to everyone: 4:16 PM

In my understanding it has to be posted at least 3 days in advance - but can be further out than that

from Andrea Starbird to everyone: 4:20 PM

Thank you! I have the same question for the UFC, in addition to asking that of the LUC

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:27 PM

Do you have ordinance covering industrial and downtown land use zones?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:29 PM

Should add they allow certified city officials be able to enter property to check when a violation occurs

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:30 PM

Is it too late to add Steve's suggestion? I've been perusing internal emails from SDCI investigations of tree crimes and they always have a problem accessing the property

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:30 PM

They can only walk to the front door.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:30 PM

OK got it! thanks:)

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:30 PM

Bainbridge Island has a provision that certified officials can enter property to check on violations. Seattle officials say they can't do this. they say

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:30 PM

We get so enthusiastic! maybe too much

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:31 PM

Portland recently extended their ordinance to include some industrial lands.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:33 PM

Huge pollution problems in industrial areas and nearbylike Georgetown and South Park areas.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:36 PM

Port and Airport are separate from City of Seattle.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:37 PM

But industrial areas should be addressed as to possible tree regulations. There are none now that I am aware of

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:38 PM

Apply where appropriate. The land use zones are addressed separately in SMC 25.11 Have a separate section on Industrial and downtown zones

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:39 PM

Can you add on bullets 6" and larger trees on site and landscape plans

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:42 PM

You nailed it, Josh!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:50 PM

2022 was a busy year for urban forestry policy, planning, and financing in Seattle. The City adopted a new tree service provider registration bill, released a draft update to SMC 25.11 (the tree and urban forest protection code), approved funding for new urban forestry staff, and discovered, through an updated canopy cover analysis, that the City is moving in the wrong direction relative to its canopy cover goals.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 5:01 PM

Thanks everyone for volunteering!

Public input: (see next page and posted notes):

From: Sarah Cassidy <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2022 12:08 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Save Our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what

replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any

building permits being approved.

11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Sarah Cassidy
sarah.farley.cassidy@gmail.com
11609 269th Way NE
Duvall, Washington 98019

From: Marek Falk <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2022 7:41 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Protect the Maple Leaf Groves!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

One of the Maple Leaf Mother Groves, at 1211 NE 104th St, is at risk of being destroyed. With your intervention, the developer of this property can achieve maximum density while retaining these groves, a win-win for people and nature.

The Maple Leaf Mother Groves are 22 "super-groves" which span entire city blocks in the Maple Leaf neighborhood. The City defines "groves" as eight or more large (12 inch dbh or larger) trees whose canopies touch. In contrast, Mother Groves span most of the properties on their blocks, and function as intact native PNW ecosystems. Because trees in groves cool each other and share defense from disease through their root network, we can count on them to be the most resilient part of our entire urban forest! They are also reservoirs of biodiversity for iconic native species which rely on forests to survive, rather than single trees along streets or in front yards.

The two groves at 1211 NE 104th St form an important part of a Mother Grove. Their removal or damage could launch a cycle of decline leading to the loss of the entire block's grove. To preserve this amazing community resource, please ensure the following:

1. Require a new arborist report. The arborist report submitted by the developer lists only 13 trees, yet 20 trees grow on this site. The report also omits an entire grove of 13 western red cedars, which are shared with adjacent properties.
2. Request that the Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU) be built on the generous amount of land available near the proposed new home, rather than where it is currently planned in the cedar grove. Both

tree groves are conveniently located on the periphery and small panhandle of the site, leaving a large buildable expanse!

3. Protect the groves during construction with rigid fencing. Currently only vinyl netting is required, which provides little protection for trees and is often moved. Construction damage to roots could send these verdant groves into a cycle of decline. If trees at the edge of the grove die, others within the grove often follow.

Climate change has brought Seattle hotter, dryer summers and stronger winter storms. The Maple Leaf Mother Groves provide the community with resilient reservoirs of cooling nature, benefitting both the community and our larger ecosystem. Please ensure they are protected and continue to thrive for the health and safety of future generations.

Thank you.

Marek Falk

Marek Falk
isophage@yahoo.com
538 NE 102nd St
Seattle, Washington 98125

From: Matt Swanson <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Friday, December 30, 2022 4:23 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Save Our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development

9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Matt Swanson
mattswanson0@gmail.com
2031 NW 59th St
Seattle, Washington 98107

From: SeattleUFC8 <SeattleUFC8@protonmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 6:26 AM

To: LEG_CouncilMembers <council@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>

Cc: David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>; Josh Morris <joshm@seattleaudubon.org>; Becca Neumann <ufc.pos4@gmail.com>; Laura Keil <lauraannekeil@gmail.com>; Morales, Tammy <Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; terese.mosqueda@seattle.gov; Lewis, Andrew <Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Year of Comprehensive Planning in Seattle

Happy New Year 2023

Seattle Mayor and City Council -

"All things share the same breath - the beast, the tree, the man. The air shares its spirit with all the life it supports."

A Quote of Chief Seattle <https://quotes.thefamouspeople.com/chief-seattle-1043.php>.

As we plan more housing for people, we must include equitable plans for trees and animal habitats such that we may all coexist in future generations. "Yes, in my City!" Progression must not permit selective elimination; as real progress will integrate all.

David Moehring AIA NCARB
Seattle WA



Res 31902 ' *"A RESOLUTION declaring the City Council's and the Mayor's intent to consider strategies to protect trees and increase Seattle's tree canopy cover"* :

Signed resolution adopted three years ago below (and 9/11/2019 Link below):

From...

<https://seattle.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7847396&GUID=CA15839D-5E86-4F9B-BF45-A06C6F79F39B>

May consider use these points:

- Page 3 of resolution calls for “city to develop more inclusive environmental programs... to not only increase tree canopy but also more equitable distribute the benefits trees bring”... yet three years past and the only budget is being for planning. We already know that Seattle is short 1000 acres of canopy cover – more if existing maturing trees are not retained.
- How many of the 1000 acres within 1000 days ... or roughly 100,000 trees will be planted in Seattle Central to meet the resolution by the targeted canopy cover date of 2037?
- We are spinning our wheels on Seattle urban forest management without data on how and why the tree canopy is declining.
- Resolution page 3 line 15, item G calls for “Tracking tree removal and replacement both on public and private land.” Can she share that tracking info to see how they are doing in the Central region.
- Similarly, the Resolution page 4 line 16, item G, indicates that the chair of the Land use and Zoning Committee – a.k.a. Dan Strauss – would receive quarterly reports starting January 31, 2020. Can she share those accumulated ten (10) quarterly reports digitally relative to tree loss and planting within central Seattle or, if not available by region, for citywide. If not able to share, is a public records request necessary?

David Moehring, AIA NCARB

Historically, Seattle has had a diversity of regulations regarding the preservation and planting trees include Tree Protection Regulations which govern when trees can be removed, regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas, Street Tree planting requirements, landscaping requirements, stormwater regulations requiring green infrastructure solutions, and requirements for tree care providers. A summary of existing regulations pertaining to trees: <https://www.seattle.gov/trees/regulations> [seattle.gov].

In addition, we are currently studying potential changes to Tree Protection Regulations to encourage the preservation and mitigation of trees during development in order to maintain trees. More information on this work is at: <https://www.seattle.gov/sdci/codes/changes-to-code/tree-protection> [seattle.gov].

Mayor will be launching a [One Seattle Tree Strategy](#) [seattle.gov] that will provide a framework for actions needed to maintain the City’s commitment to a 30% tree canopy cover goal. This initiative will:

1. inventory, protect and maintain existing trees to promote canopy growth;
2. plant new trees in communities with low canopy;

3. pilot innovative approaches to managing multiple needs in limited spaces like rights-of-way and private property;
4. engage residents and business owners on tree planting and care to foster and sustain trees on private land;
5. coordinate opportunities for planting and maintenance across departments and with community, school district and other partners.

The proposed budget for this effort includes \$320,000 to increase urban forestry tree crews' capacity to plant trees in parks, \$300,000 for greening industrial properties, \$150,000 at OSE for a Tree Canopy Equity and Resilience Plan.

Seattle continues to set an example as a leading climate-forward city – driving a One Seattle Climate Agenda based on reducing fossil fuels, creating green jobs, and supporting communities most impacted by pollution and climate change. Mayor Harrell's budget proposal makes needed and bold investments to take on the climate crisis, enhance climate resilience, and advance clean air, fresh water, and accessible open spaces for every community. More information on our overall approach to Urban Forestry including the City's Urban Forest Management Plan is available at: <https://www.seattle.gov/trees> [seattle.gov].

We greatly appreciate your comments about the importance of trees in our urban environment and hope that you will stay involved as we continue this important work.

Best,

Cara Kadoshima Vallier

Mayoral Assistant (She/Her/Hers)

[Office of Mayor Bruce Harrell](#) [seattle.gov] | City of Seattle

O: 206-256-6814 | Email: cara.vallier2@seattle.gov (please note the "2")

Removing trees creates "[heat islands](#) [seattletimes.com]" and the city seems to be okay with allowing more of these type of areas that negatively impact health in the Central District and South Seattle. These areas were historically home to Black and Brown people that fought for equitable investment that makes life better for us, not worse. Allowing new dwellings to be built without protecting our urban forests makes our neighborhoods [less livable](#) [seattletimes.com].

Change is movement away from the present. And change is movement toward a future that promises not just something different but, hopefully, something better.

.....Roger D. Duncan

From: Becca Neumann <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 9:41 AM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Strengthen Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt

registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and

- larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
 5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
 6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
 7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
 8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
 9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
 10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
 11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
 12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
 13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
 14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
 15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
 16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
 17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Becca Neumann
neumann.becca@gmail.com
8011 19th Ave NE
Seattle, Washington 98115

From: Thornton Creek Alliance <thorntoncreekalliance@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 10:25 AM

To: Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>

Cc: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Nelson, Sara <Sara.Nelson@seattle.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@seattle.gov>; Pedersen, Alex <Alex.Pedersen@seattle.gov>; Juarez, Debora <Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov>; Morales, Tammy <Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Herbold, Lisa <Lisa.Herbold@seattle.gov>; Sawant, Kshama <Kshama.Sawant@seattle.gov>; Lewis, Andrew <Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov>; Lowe, Marco <Marco.Lowe@seattle.gov>; Torgelson, Nathan <Nathan.Torgelson@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Non-reconfirmation to the UFC of David Moehring, Position 8

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Mayor Harrell:

The Thornton Creek Alliance board is saddened to learn that architect David Moehring's second term has not been renewed for the Urban Forestry Commission when he was one of very few professionals creating and presenting methods for trees and new construction to co-exist. The UFC is, after all, intended to help develop ideas for preserving and enhancing our urban forest even as the city grows. Who else could fill this position on behalf of the development community with more useful insight and creativity than Mr. Moehring?

We have heard that some developers were convinced that he opposes development, but we can promise you this is not the case. Here is the iCloud link for his presentation at our April 28, 2022, public meeting (policy ideas begin about min. 5:30): <https://tinyurl.com/David-M-4-28-22>* . Here he is presenting at the Partners in Community Forestry conference in Seattle on November 17, 2022 (min .50): <https://youtu.be/UyoMCL8WCv8> Please watch these and decide for yourself.

Adding positions to the commission to bring forward more voices and perspectives has been done in the past, and it could serve the City well to do so again, but simply replacing Mr. Moehring on the UFC cannot be considered beneficial.

We hope you will reconsider. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dan Keefe, President
Ruth Williams, Land Use Chair and Past President

*Thus URL will be available for three weeks. We are happy to send you a new one on request.

THORNTON CREEK ALLIANCE (TCA), founded in 1993, is an all-volunteer, grassroots, nonprofit organization of over 160 members from Shoreline and Seattle, dedicated to preserving and restoring an ecological balance throughout the Thornton Creek watershed. Our goal is to benefit the watershed by encouraging individuals, neighborhoods, schools, groups, businesses, agencies, and government to work together in addressing the environmental restoration of the creek system including: water quality, stabilization of water flow, flood prevention, and habitat improvement through education, collaboration, and community involvement.

--

www.thornton-creek-alliance.org
www.facebook.com/Thornton.Creek.Alliance